UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,477	06/20/2001	Gunther L. Brenes	53470.003008	9574

7590   05/06/2004

Brian M. Buroker
Hunton & Williams
Suite 1200
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER
LU, KUEN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	10

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/884,477	BRENES ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Kuen S Lu	2177

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 February 2004*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 4-31* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-2 & 4-31* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6,7/9-23,26-2002*.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____ .

Supplement to Non-Final Action

The Applicants' Amendment filed on 2/13/2004 is noted and consider. The

Amendment is being addressed in the following "*DETAILED ACTION*" and "*Response*

to Arguments" Sections.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicants are reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the
disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet
within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since
the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and
legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The
abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need
for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should
avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined
by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains phrase "The

invention" which can be implied. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

2. Claim 15 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for

failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to

cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent

form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. In Claim 15, "The method of claim 1"

is an improper dependent form. For this Office Action, the Examiner interprets it as

"The method of claim 13".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted
on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for
patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have
the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the
international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such
treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-2, 13-14, 25-26 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

anticipated by Eynard et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0174050, hereafter "Eynard").

As per claims 1, 13, 25 and 27, Eynard teaches the following:

"network server for receiving user input to remotely manipulate or modify at least

one report ,generated by at least one data source, the user input being initiated

by activation of a markup language construct associated with the at least one

report" at Page 2, [0019] and Fig. 1 where users (elements 104-106) access the

server (element 102) via the network (element 103), and at Fig. 2, elements 202-

210 and Page 3, [0032] where user data including markup language structure

(Page 4, [0035]) is input to the server, at Page 4, [0037] and Fig. 3B where files

in the file groups may be implemented as a portion of a database (Fig. 1,

elements 114-116 and Page 4, [0038]) and generated to be presented to the

user, and at Page 3, [0032] where file replies to the user confirms with

XML/HTML formats; and

"a reporting server, communicating with the user interface, the reporting server

being configured to respond to the user input to manipulate the at least one

report generated from the at least one data source by accessing an image of the

at least one report, and generating results to present via the user interface" at

Fig. 2, elements 202-204 where user communicates with the user interface

(element 103) to the server (Fig. 3B, element 102), and at Fig. 2, elements 202-

204 and Fig. 3B, elements 304/334 and Page 3, [0032] and Page 4, [0037]

where server receives user input and the server manager services process

receives direction and provides result from files in the group files, including in

forms or presentation format, and at Page 4, [0037]; [0040]-[0041] and Page 8,

[0052] where the manage-presentation-services process manipulates the data

and presents to the user.

As per Claims 2, 14, 26 and 28, Eynard teaches "the image of the at least one

report comprises an image stored in at least one of an electronic memory and a

storage medium of the reporting server" at Fig. 1, element 116 and Page 3,

[0026] where node data may be stored on any conventional memory, including

RAM, disk and tape.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the
prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention
was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability
shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4-10, 16-22 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Eynard et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0174050, hereafter "Eynard") as

applied to Claims 1-2, 13-14, 25-26 and 27-28 above, and in view of Hanzek (U.S. Patent 6,654,726).

As per Claim 15, Eynard teaches server includes communication and data management software for operation on a conventional network at Page 2, [0020].

Eynard does not specifically teach "communicating with the user interface via a network server".

However, Hanzek teaches "communicating with the user interface via a network server" at Figs. 7A-7C where user (element 603) communicates via web server (element 605) and intranet server (element 642).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Eynard's teaching into Hanzek's by implementing network services on the server because both references directed to system for business operation and resource management and the combination would have had provided the server with the flexibility for the formation and operation of a dynamic world-wide exchange using networked computer technology.

As per Claims 4, 16 and 29, Hanzek further teaches "the network server comprises a Web server" at Figs. 7A-7C where user (element 603) communicates via web server (element 605).

As per Claims 5 and 17, Hanzek further teaches the following:

"translate the user input received via first network enabled code to second network enabled code" at Fig. 2, elements 120-122, 130 and 116, col. 6, lines 39-50 and Fig. 7B, elements 605-610 and col. 11, lines 1-25 where user input received from the

consumer/product provider user interface at the first network for communicating via

networks and the portals running at server, process consumer requests, including order

confirmation, and generate response, for example, an XML message request routed by

the web server to a locate inventory process for responding the request;

"access the at least one data resource via the second network enabled code" at

col. 11, lines 46-60 where inventory locate process accesses an inventory database for

responding consumer's request; and

"present results to the user via the first network enabled code" at col. 11, lines 63-67

where processes may generate a tag response message, format and display the

message to the consumer.

As per Claims 6, 18 and 30, Hanzek further teaches "the first network enabled code

comprises at least HTML code" at col. 7, lines 46-61 where browser pages using HTML

code.

As per Claims 7 and 19, Hanzek further teaches "the second network enabled code

comprises at least HTML code" at Fig. 3, elements 322 and 318, and col. 7, line 46 –

col. 8, line 24 where the portals communicating with inventory database generate

response in HTML message for presenting to the consumer.

As per Claims 8 and 20, Hanzek further teaches "user input is received from a Web

browser" at col. 11, lines 1-25 where user input an XML message request received from

the consumer/product provider user interface and routed by the web server to a locate

inventory process for responding the request.

As per Claims 9 and 21, Hanzek further teaches "at least one data source comprises at least one OLAP-enabled database" at Fig. 33, element 668 is the OLAP-enabled database.

As per Claims 10 and 22, Hanzek further teaches "wherein the results presented to the user are modifiable" at col. 3, lines 9-15 where consumer order information is modifiable.

5. Clams 11-12, 23-24 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eynard et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0174050, hereafter "Eynard") as applied to Claims 1-2, 13-14, 25-26 and 27-28 above, and in view of Hanzek (U.S. Patent 6,654,726), as applied to Claims 4-10, 15-22 and 29-30, and further in view of Nwabueze. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0144174).

As per claim 11 and 23, the Hanzek-Eynard combined reference teaches user's input and system response for remote user data access as described in Items 3 and 4.

The combined reference does not specifically teach the modifying the result of the cube data.

However, Nwabueze teaches "the modifications to the results comprise at least one of a table pivot, a pageby, a recalculated sum and a recalculated sort" at Page 8, [0074], lines 7-10 by allowing customer to modify the presentation of data in an OLAP cube in order to examine multiple business metrics for previously undetected relationship.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Nwazueze and Hanzek's references with

Eynard's by allowing user to further modify the result cube because by doing so the presentation of report would be more flexible to fit business metrics for undetected relationship.

As per claims 12, 24 and 31, the combined reference does not specifically teach modifying results being activated by URL link or query box.

However, Nwabueze teaches "the modifications to the results are activated by at least one of a URL link and a query box" at Page 8, [0075], lines 14-16 and Page 5, [0054], lines 17-20 by referring URLs in the page view and referring Query Wizard, respectively.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Nwabueze and Hanzek's references with Eynard's by allowing users better equipped to modify the end-result because by doing so analysts and managers would gain insight into data through fast, consistent, interactive access to a wide variety of possible views of information that has been transformed from raw data to reflect the real dimensionality of the enterprise as understood by the user.

6. The prior art made of record

    A. U.S. Pub. No.   2002/0174050

    B. U.S. Patent No.   6,654,726

    C. U.S. Pub. No.   2002/0144174

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

D. U.S. Pub. No.   2002/0059098

E. U.S. Patent No.   6,708,155

U. Oracle, Oracle9i OLAP, A Scalable Web_Based Business Intelligence Platform,

An Oracle White Paper, April 2001

V. Oracle, Oracle9i OLAP Services, Concepts and Administration Guide, Release 1

(9.0.1), June 2001

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2 and 4-31 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusions

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 703-305-4894.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Kuen S. Lu

Patent Examiner

April 27, 2004

JOHN GREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100